

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated October 10, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-4 are withdrawn in this application. Claims 5-14 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 5 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 5-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 5 and 11 have been amended, so the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is now moot.

Claims 5-10 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “stepping the mask in the first direction by several micrometers to a fixed position within the block using the mask stage.” Claims 11-14 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “stepping the mask in the first direction by several micrometers to a fixed position within the block so that the plurality of slits correspond to next portions of the block that have not been crystallized.” None of the previously cited references including Im (U.S. Patent No. 6,368,945) teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Im teaches continuously moving the mask in the y direction while emitting pulses of light. This is contrary to the present invention where the mask is stepped to a fixed position. Once in that position, the laser applies pulses to the amorphous silicon film. The process then repeats for a whole block. Thus Im does not teach at least this feature of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-14 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner remove the finality of the office action as Applicant put forth additional argument to overcome the previous rejection by the Examiner and the further grounds of rejection provided in the Advisory Action. While the Examiner did not find such argument persuasive, Applicants assert that a final rejection was not appropriate as there were no art rejections actually pending and applicants provided further argument to

overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Therefore, applicants respectfully request entry and full consideration of the current amendments.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9 February 2007

By



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No. 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant